

Pictures from a rocket: English and the semiotic take

GUNTHER KRESS

*School of Culture, Language and Communication, Institute of Education,
University of London*

interviewed by ANDREW BURN

Institute of Education, University of London

ABSTRACT: *In this interview, Gunther Kress proposes how English needs to expand beyond its traditional linguistic frame into a semiotic frame which recognizes not only the visual but other modes. He argues also for a shift to forms of production in which the acts of reflection and meaning-making are fused, rather than separating the production of new meanings from a retrospective critical process. These and other changes, he suggests, will make possible new, more profound understandings of language, as partial and as one mode among many.*

KEYWORDS: *Semiotics, multimodality, visual, English, representation and communication.*

AB: I thought we might start with the idea of the English literary tradition, because the turn to the visual is a phenomenon of the contemporary moment but it's also a historical fact that text and image are closely implicated in the body of texts that English constitutes as part of its domain. So I wondered what you thought about that implication and about how new semiotic approaches or multimodal approaches might encourage teachers to look differently at the ways in which text and image are configured in that history.

GK: I thought back over my own education in English literature and thought where I had seen the use of image directly, other than in, say, *Alice in Wonderland* and texts of that kind and I thought back to 16th Century texts like Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, but also to printers and book-sellers of that time, who must have been feeling very close to the traditional illustrated book, attempting to use layout and font in a similar way – in the 17th Century, I'm thinking of iconic layouts of poems, for instance, by poets such as Herbert. In German picaresque novels of the 17th century – such as *Simplizius Simplizissimus* – you have what must have been “lavish illustrations” in the form of many woodcuts, as you do, in a much lesser way of course, in the *Faerie Queene*.

AB: What about the way in which illustration diminishes in the Twentieth Century, and Alice's question, what's the point of a book with no pictures or conversation? Illustrations become relegated to children's literature effectively.

GK: Exactly, that's where it goes to. And I wonder when it did die out. I haven't got a clear enough recollection of say Aphra Behn and Daniel Defoe, people like that, or whether and where some of the illustrations or woodcuts had migrated to, from *The pilgrim's progress*. Leaving that aside, Blake is the obvious instance. How are such texts represented in modern curricula? In my own experience of English at university

– in the 1960s, in Australia – texts appeared as literary entities and were discussed as such. Even Blake was really no exception.

I suppose, before I say something about “modern curricula”, the first question is what is the English curriculum that we imagine? I think there are now very many English curricula around that we imagine collectively. Maybe one prominent one is that which has been present in many teachers’ imaginations and practices – the BFI-influenced English curriculum, the site where the media can appear. More recent instances might be an English curriculum which is multimedial as well as multimodal, where the novel on the CD Rom might be a real instance. There are two kinds of things in which I think the visual has been in the English curriculum in recent times. The BFI kind of work was not only influenced by film and television but, as you know, also by an interest in photography. And then more recently, I suppose, the emergence of literary texts in the new medium of the CD Rom and what that entails. Here the question emerges as to what kinds of transformations the text undergoes when it appears as a CD Rom with all its facilities: is the novel on the CD ROM still a novel in the sense that I was taught to understand it, or has it (quite often) become a kind of quasi-documentary?

And then the contemporary question, where the English curriculum is on the verge of becoming a curriculum of communication, what is the place of the literary canon in that imagined English curriculum? And to mention at that point a phenomenon which has been commented on, the form and look of current anthologies of English, in which text appears in uniform typeface, as extract in little handbooks. Here the original look of the text, with its font and its layout and the texture of the paper, has actually given way completely to a homogenised notion of text – now no longer a literary text but a very abstracted sense of text, not as a tangible, sensuous, literary object, but as an “instance” of text, a specimen. All that makes me think, well, what is the place of the canon now other than as a kind of a “citing”, a memory, or a truly superficial genuflection to something nearly forgotten. Even when Shakespeare appears, quite often in the most reduced form, appearing as one act which gets studied for twelve lessons.

All this leads to the question: “How do the young come to the literary canon?” Is it via television – the televised film of the Jane Austen novel? Or do they come to the canon in the various forms of dramatic genres? Shakespeare mediated through Eastenders, so to speak. Those are the kinds of questions one would ask. And then, what would a new conception of the English curriculum be, in which literature is present in a form that speaks to young people? What representational forms and what media ought it to be relying on. How it could be addressed by teachers will depend to a very large extent on what kinds of force are exerted on the classroom through policy, which is partly what we explored in the study on English classrooms in urban settings (Kress *et al*, 2005). It’s influenced by who the people – children and teachers – in the classroom are. It’s influenced by what traditions the department holds to, by what kinds of principles and practices or conceptions it adopts, and by what the teacher herself or himself imagines. So, I think the big question is: What is the curriculum now that we imagine or that we might conceive of?

[AB: Can I just pick up your characterisation of text here? Am I right in detecting in this characterisation a kind of sense of gain and loss? I’m assuming when you say we](#)

need to imagine a shift from page to screen in your document on the conversation about the English curriculum in the UK (Kress, 2005), that's partly what you mean. That in this shift, while there might be gains of certain kinds, in moving towards more fluid and more available and more adaptable forms of text, that there are also losses in that in some respects they become differently material, somehow detached from their origins?

GK: One response I also have to your first question is: How do we conceive of literature and what is the function of literature? If literature now, as in the stuff you have done when you were teaching in Parkside, or your colleague James Durran does (Burn & Durran, in press), is where Shakespeare appears in that tension between the skeletal written representation, and its possible instantiations in visual form, whether one takes various versions of film versions of a Shakespeare play, or allows young people to play with the possibilities of what could this character be meaning in this particular scene, and if we locate this character on this side of the screen or that side of the screen what can it mean. What has literature become there? That in itself is an interesting question. In the move from the purely literary – that is, that to which we have access through writing – to the multimodally instantiated, and to a medium in which you can actually be productive and reproductive and re-designing, what is the conception of literature in that? Is it now about ethical issues? Is it still about notions of metaphor, of character and characterisation?

The gains I would see are the gains of allowing young people to be productive and to be genuinely exploratory rather than abstractly critical. I think actually being able to play with an image or a scene and changing it, that sense of what the potentials are of re-presentation is very different to a somewhat detached discussion that maybe is assumed in the notion of being critical. That I would see is the gain. But in the presentation where the QCA (the UK's Qualifications and Curriculum Authority) presented its new notion around the English curriculum, English 21, there was quite a note of scepticism and even hostility from parts of the audience towards James Durran's presentation. Because people felt that literariness had actually been lost. I think the question then has become: What is the canon when it's represented in new modes and in new media? I don't know.

AB: Can I move on to another question, which is that in the paper you've written for this conversation about the English curriculum in the UK, English 21, you've also proposed a shift from linguistic ways of thinking to semiotic ways of thinking. And I'm just wondering how you see that working out for the ways in which English teachers currently approach language as the central idea of signification in their work. What will they have to do to move from a linguistic to a semiotic way of thinking?

GK: It really puts into question the seemingly certain category of language for a start, in at least two ways. If, in a multimodally-constituted text, all the modes make a contribution to meaning, then each mode makes a partial contribution to the total meaning, and that includes the spoken or written part of that multimodal ensemble. So one needs to see language as partial, whereas our commonsense understanding had always been of language as a full medium, as providing a full means of representation. I think that would be the first step, that the place of language has to be rethought.

And the boundaries of what we think of as language have to be rethought, too. So on the page, things which in an exam anthology disappear, namely the notions of font, of line spacings, of layout, the quality of paper on which the text appears, all of these are, in a semiotic conception, newly significant. This would return to that conception of the 16th century poem with its woodcut emblem at the top, which orients the reader in some way, or the Herbert poem laid out visually like an altar, where teachers would have had to pay attention to those features. A renewed attention in detail to all aspects of representation in the text. The semiotic “take” says: “Pay attention to everything that is there”, where the linguistic take said: “Pay attention to features of language”. It goes back in a way to a tradition of practical criticism, which paid detailed attention to “what is here”, but “what is here” had been framed in a particular way, that is, where “What is here” was represented as “Where does this word fit historically?” And, historically, “Where does this genre come from?” Now we are again saying, “Pay a lot of attention,” but the frame is set differently, much more widely.

AB: Obviously there are all kinds of implications here and battles for hearts and minds in the ways in which teachers might be educated in these ways of thinking. But if you assume that all of that could be got over somehow, would your ideal of the school curriculum and the way in which this is managed be that there’s a general sense of multimodal semiotics that might be shared by English teachers, Art teachers, Music teachers, Design Technology teachers?

GK: Yes.

AB: And the English people contribute the linguistic expertise?

GK: No.

AB: Or would it be that the English curriculum is still a kind of repository for a particular set of theories about signification which everybody else would contribute to? Or neither?

GK: I think the question of how meaning is received is a question which is maybe more specific to English – I don’t know what a Music teacher might think. I’m not going to talk about the Music curriculum which I think is in a sense is quite different to the English curriculum, because the English curriculum goes back to my question: What is English for? And I see that as having a very different answer to the question: “What is Music for?” Those two questions would have very, very different answers. What English is for has been, and should continue to be, the issue of how we represent ourselves in our world and how we make sense of representations for us in our world. And I would draw a much wider frame around representation, in the way that Roland Barthes would have said: When I see the shape of a car in the street, it offers me a communication about what the world is like. When I go and see a wrestling match or have my steak and chips or whatever, that’s communication. English ought to ask: “For the people who are in school, what are the relevant forms of representation in their world?” That would include the traditional text, it would include all forms of publicly significant communication, the televisual, whatever the forms of text are, the advertising billboard which is still around. And I would want

English to be able to speak about what it means to wear this kind of sneaker, or to want to “kill” for a pair of sneakers because they have such significance.

The second thing, which relates to that, is that English has always been a curriculum of value, of values, of evaluation. Which, of course, could be said also for Music and could also be said for Art or for Religious Education, but I think in very different ways. English is the curriculum not of ethical systems but of principles of making ethical judgements, that is, judgements about a value. It puts the question: “What resources have I chosen in this situation to shape an object to be represented to this audience?” That question has been there in the past, though confined to the literary domain. I think that question should remain, but its domain of application be much expanded. The question of aesthetics, namely, what value is attributed to this object in the social world, for what are essentially political reasons, that question needs to become newly important and central, in the shift from a former set of frames, given by the nation state or the nation’s church or whatever, to a situation in which the market has obliterated those structures and their values and is presenting its own heterogeneous values in a time of huge uncertainty. I think the function of English in saying, “Well, this is what we will deal with. How do we make judgments about value, about what is valuable and what is valued?” is an absolutely central issue in education now. In that sense there are continuing strands for English about the making and receiving of meaning; and there is a continuing strand about, “How do we think about style as choices that I make which are significant for me in my environment?” Beyond it stands the question of how style congeals into aesthetics and how my aesthetics can become valued in a larger social group.

AB: The Music and Art teacher question, I was posing also at a practical level. Suppose you were trying to deal with one of the Child ballads (Child, 1965) or with a pop video and you’ve got something which is clearly partly the semiotic territory in which your subject discipline falls or is familiar with and is partly in the territory of the Music department. Would the ideal situation be if you shared an approach to multimodal meaning-making?

GK: No doubt. And I think it would require a much more fundamental rethinking of curriculum than is likely to happen for the next ten years. My conception of English, as a means of giving an account of culturally salient representations, would not ignore Music. How could it ignore Music when it, in contemporary forms of (popular) music, is probably more significant at this time than literary forms. For the time being I think that Art and Music are likely to remain concerned with a different set of issues and a differently conceived notion of aesthetics. Yes, there needs to be profound rethinking in this area. But, in any case, in the UK it’s too difficult to imagine that at the moment.

AB: It’s very hard for a Monday morning! I’ll just shift to the idea of what children could understand about those semiotic processes at a metacognitive level, which has always been in English, the question of linguistics, but more narrowly grammar teaching. If there was a shift from a linguistic to a semiotic frame of mind for the teacher, what would the implication be for the debate about metacognitive understandings of signification that children might engage with?

GK: I had circled the word “metacognitive” in your question because I don’t quite know what it means.

AB: I’m thinking really of Bruner’s notion of the capacity to turn round and reflect on language.

GK: I think the capacity to reflect has most recently been called “critique”, being (able to be) critical, which I’m not sure is actually the same as being able – and willing – to reflect. For me, the reason why “critique” is not quite the same as “reflect” is because critique builds on a notion which preceded it, namely that of competence. You would be competent in a particular domain and then on the basis of that competence you might be able to provide a critique of something somebody else had done in whatever domain. Reflection goes beyond the production on the basis of competence to a deep understanding of the potentials of the resources for communication which you are about to use, what the social environment of message-production is, and what, for me centrally, what my desires are in this environment in relation to others. In a period when you thought that language was a full means of representation – that you could say, think, feel everything in and through language – you didn’t really reflect on what language could *not* do. Rather, you reflected on the resources that language offered as a given. And then you might ask how language had been used – how this person had used language in relation to me to achieve certain kinds of purposes? These were questions around “bias”, power, oppression, and so on. For me the problem with that stance is that “critique” – and “reflection” if that is how we understand it – is always retrospective, an action that happens on the basis of the past action according to an agenda of others.

The politics of a social semiotic take on all of this is profoundly different. It assumes that I would now have to say: “If I want to speak or write about events and actions in the world – real or imagined – I know that a temporally-organised mode – speech or writing, for instance – allows me to do things quite differently to a spatially-organised mode – image, for instance”. Now such a judgment requires a different level of reflection because it says, “These are the purposes I have, and I have not just choices within a single resource, but even before that, I have a choice from a multiplicity of resources for realizing the meanings which I wish to instantiate. Is it better to do so through the spatial mode of image or through temporal mode of writing?” That is not a reflection on what has been produced by someone else, but it’s a (prior) reflection on the potentials for making meaning through the potentials of different resources. That is actually very different. It’s a heightening of the possibility of reflection, or maybe not so much a heightening as a normalising of the need for reflection, without the negative and limiting notion of critique.

And, if I might say so, my objection to the concept of metacognition is that it seems to separate reflection as action from the usual practice of making meaning. In my view that is not how we usually act in our lives – though at certain moments we do and should have the means for doing so. Rather I think that that sense of choice among possibilities with a full awareness of what possibilities there are should be an entirely usual, an entirely unremarkable part of making – or taking – meaning.

AB: I suppose what I’m trying to get a sense of is, does the subject English, and what the children reflect on, still require a kind of specialist understanding of language as

its particular domain, as well as the sort of semiotic notions which cross all modes. I mean, they can have an understanding of narrative across modes throughout the curriculum, but an understanding of the affordances of language is not going to be addressed by Art and Music teachers.

GK: No, well, they might, if they talk about a Schubert song or rapping. But I think what we will get, through this semiotic approach, is a more profound understanding of language than we had. As you know, I have a long history of quite detailed engagement with language; one that long predates the present rediscovery of the importance of “grammar”; an interest in really understanding the inner workings of the resource of speech and writing at the nitty-gritty level of grammar and syntax – not as mere form but as a potential for making meaning. My interests now are in expanding our sense of what language actually is. And just as we got a more profound understanding of our planet by seeing a picture taken from a rocket up in space and seeing from there the entire limitation of our planet – that we were living on this small, finite thing among those other things in space – so I think that to see language in a semiotic sense, as one of many means for making meaning, all with differently configured potentials, that I think will deepen our sense of what language is. That can bring a profound change in thinking.

AB: And this is what we might want instead of what we’re currently calling literacy?

GK: This is what I think we would need and, if we needed to, we could call it literacy. Having that in a subject called English is slightly incongruous, but I think we can’t at the moment get rid, in England, of the title English and maybe there is no great urgency about that. In other countries, as you know, in South Africa, they got rid of that and had a curriculum called Communication. But yes, that’s what English ought to be dealing with, among other things.

AB: And in Australia and New Zealand?

GK: As far as I know they’ve kept English. But I’m not completely up-to-date.

AB: So can we move on to talk about your recent research project on the multimodal production of school English (Kress et al, 2005)? And you’ve referred to it already a little bit.

GK: We had two questions. One was: “What has been the effect of government policy over the decade or so that a series of UK governments have concerned themselves intensely with English, more so maybe than with other curriculum subjects; What’s been the effect of government policy on the subject as it is actually ‘produced’ in classrooms?” “Has policy actually managed to achieve the uniformity and homogeneity of the production of English in different classrooms?” The second was a quite different, perhaps more straightforward methodological question. English has always been approached linguistically, that is, as a subject constituted in language; and so the question was “Would a multimodal approach show something different?”

What we found, to our satisfaction, was that a multimodal approach *does* show something different – even in relation to the subject English conceived in older terms, as for instance with a notion such as sensibility for instance – or the notion of ability

of students. And we also saw that a real sense of what the curriculum is taken to be in a particular classroom, is never fully or clearly expressed in what is spoken or in what is written by the teacher or by the students. But it is very much “expressed” and communicated by all sorts of other means. The notion of sensibility for instance appears in ways other than linguistic: in the manner in which he or she deals with a text, holds a book, treats the relation between the text to be studied and other objects, or in the way a teacher approaches a group of children to talk about a text they are discussing. Does she do this in a conversational manner? Or in a highly didactic manner? Is it in terms of a discussion between equals? In some ways this can have linguistic realization, but in large parts it has an entirely non-linguistic instantiation.

The very present notion of ability, for instance, is never spoken, nor announced, in the sense of, “I will now move to this table, which has four or five people who are less able than you whom I’ve just left.” But it is certainly instantiated in non-linguistic ways which are clearly understood by all in the classroom. Here, with the “able ones”, the teacher leans, casually, in a friendly manner, on the edge of the table and has a brief discussion. There, the teacher sits down, dictates, scribes for the children. She has a completely different attitude at two tables, has placed one dictionary on one table but five dictionaries on the other. Those kinds of things are never spoken. So one might nearly say that things which are important but unspeakable have to be represented in a different way. And among the unspeakable things in the English classroom are, nowadays in England, in the schools that we looked at, questions such as, “What, actually, do we think the curriculum is?” This comes out, say, as a contrast where in one classroom there are pictures of rock stars, posters of contemporary films, Kung-fu movies, posters of the culture of the children themselves decorating the wall, the implication being, we thought, that English is the subject which provides resources for the young people for making sense of their world. In another classroom, very carefully framed terms and concepts from the national curriculum, “genre” for instance, something from media studies, “mise-en-scene”, central terms from the curriculum framed, neatly displayed. These form the constantly present visual surrounding of the children in this classroom. The implication here being that English can be, maybe, like Science, represented in the form of curriculum entities. Success in English in the one classroom is seen as “you will understand your own world better”; in the other classroom, success in English is seen as “you will get to know the entities which are set out in the national curriculum”. But I think neither conception could actually be spoken. I think teachers would not want to say, “English isn’t about your world,” or “English is about something which has nothing to do with your world really.”

In the classrooms we saw, those kinds of things were not spoken and yet they were insistently there. As indeed was the layout of the classroom, whether arranged in cafeteria style, or more traditionally in rows. In each case the layout suggested approaches to the knowledge of the subject, sometimes as notions of constructivism, people co-constructing the knowledge of English, in other instances the layout suggested an authoritarian teaching approach to knowing English. Again, those things again could not be spoken. One teacher whose classroom had a very traditional, very conservative layout of desks in line, with herself at the front, allowed the children enormous freedom of disposing their bodies – slouching onto the desk or leaning back, with no attempt to control how they would use their space at the desk. Those kinds of things couldn’t be subject of an overtly articulated pedagogy, a spoken

pedagogy. It was, largely, expressed through movements, through dispositions of bodies but not spoken.

AB: In a way, in the emphasis on the lives and cultures of young people, there's an echo of the politics of the personal growth model of English that John Dixon enunciated and the attitudes to language, oral language particularly, that James Britton and Harold Rosen valued. But there's also something different, isn't there? So in what ways is this kind of emphasis different from their emphasis on the culture of children?

GK: I think these are quite different ideologies. In the Harold Rosen version, my reading of *Language and Class* (Rosen, 1972) viewed it as a kind of a Marxist attempt to reinstate voices which had been excluded and to put them into the frame, which went along with similar agendas for feminists; and a similar agenda in history, through oral history. In other words, let those who have never spoken or who had never been heard, speak and be heard. In the case of *Growth through English* (Dixon, 1967), I think there was a very different kind of ideology again, of a notion of organicness, the unfolding of inner dispositions, latently always there. And some years later, in Australia, there were people with whom we fought battles over this, because they thought of the provision of explicit resources as being inhibiting and stifling, like putting mulch over tender plants. So I think these two were ideologically very different to the presence now of popular culture in classrooms, in which there is a conception of culture in a new way, after Raymond Williams and post-colonial cultural studies. In other words a battle has been won – a recognition of the value of culture other than elite culture.

AB: Okay, shall we move on to the last question? There's a tension between an argument for English as part of a general conception of multimodality and English in terms of the visual. So in a way it's a question about how do you balance the importance of the visual against the general multimodal spectrum. But it's also a question about, in the juggling that goes on, how important is orality? I'm simply asking it partly because for me sometimes orality has been a better metaphor than literacy for the kinds of new communicative practice that happen in new media. But also a better way of relating those new forms to traditional forms of narrative and social exchange.

GK: The opposition maybe is in any case no longer one of orality and literacy, if, as I am beginning to do, you no longer use the term language, because speech and writing are so different in what they offer as representational resources. So then speech and writing become simply two modes among many. So it's no longer a polar opposite within the same mode. But the opposition which you point to is between a resource which is relatively fluid and dynamic (say, speech, but also dance, maybe video and film) and the less fluid and less dynamic (maybe writing, still images, objects) – the spatially organized as against the temporally organized. And maybe also between modes and forms which have not been subject to rigorous codification against those which *have* been subject to rigorous codification. And I think I would attempt to think about it in those terms, because the world itself is moving towards fluidity. So ways of thinking might be a general kind of opposition of the temporal versus the spatial, and of the less or non-codified versus the strongly codified. Link that with digital media and the possibilities that they provide to the individual user for being

agentive. In speech you can be agentive: you can shape speech to your needs much more than you can shape writing. In games you can be agentive, but differently agentive, within the parameters of the game. So that's how I would see it. My guru Michael Halliday thought that the oral form, the spoken form, was essential for producing dynamism, in contrast to written language, because in principle it is fluid, dynamic and less codified. Maybe that's what applies in a much more general way, if you become a little bit more abstract, to that distinction.

AB: This is Halliday's metaphor of written language as like hard and jewel-like and spoken language as like a river?

GK: Yes, that's right. Crystalline as against mountain streams falling over rocks or something. And his assumption was that you couldn't do real scientific thinking in the rigid categories of written form, you could not do truly innovative thinking.

AB: I'm just thinking about Ong's arguments about the history of orality as one of the oral formulaic which rather paradoxically actually is codified in certain sorts of ways?

GK: This is why I make that distinction; I think that they are separate variables. I once had a note from Dell Hymes in response to *Learning to Write* (Kress, 1982), in which I had made a thing about the Hallidayan point. And he said, well actually, having studied all these American languages, what you find there are highly codified, ritualistic forms in the spoken mode. And then you would have to see in what media one is operating. I don't know what kind of fluidity or degree of freedom there actually is in computer games? There are frames, but within the frames a very large number of possibilities which are not necessarily fixed or predictable in all ways, maybe more like the degree of freedom you have in the use of intonation for emphasis, which is relatively uncontrolled. Well, it's controlled to a certain extent in terms of social class and cultural difference. The "proper" upper class speaker doesn't allow her or himself much intonational movement. When I see you play with the avatars in games, I sense that there is a significant degree of fluidity and freedom.

AB: Yes, the analogy I've sometimes used is Halliday's point about restricted languages in games. There's a high degree of freedom with a very restricted set of representational resources. Finally, do you have anything to add about the relation between book and screen? In your paper for the English 21 discussion, your point about the move from book to screen raised a kind of anxiety about the book as a sentimental object in the English tradition.

GK: I would say, speaking somewhat technically, that the word *book* is not a sign but a signifier. What I mean by that is that the word *book* is in no way a stable thing. If one looks at what books have been over, let's say, a thousand years of north western European history, one finds a huge variety and change. And if one looks to other parts of the world then there is an even larger variety. Etymologically, the word book comes from the word beech, as in beech-tree; thin slabs of beech were carved and runes were scratched on these and they were bundled up. That was a book. What it is important to do is to look at a constant trade between the various media. The cultural technology of writing is changing, and so are the cultural technologies of dissemination, the media. The technologies, too, are independent and always linked. The dominant technology for dissemination at the moment is the screen, and it is

influencing the book. It's important to think of the technology of writing or of visual representation as quite distinct from the technology of dissemination. The media – the screen or book – will continue, but their relations to modes will change. The word “book” and maybe even something like the object book will survive. But it will be much changed; and their relation with modes will change. That's how I would see it. But, as a medium, the book will continue, though in always changing form, as it always did. The really close constellation of the mode of writing and the medium of the book that we knew, and which shaped cultural imaginations over the last two or three centuries, that I think will change.

I'm trying at the moment to say that we need to think separately about the three cultural technologies of communication: that of representation, that of production and that of dissemination, because they are always independently variable and always brought into conjunction.

REFERENCES

- Burn, A., & Durran, J. (in press). Digital anatomies: Analysis as production in media education. In D. Buckingham & R. Willett (Eds.), *Digital generations: Children, young people and new media*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Child, F. (Ed.). (1965). *The English and Scottish popular ballads*. New York: Dover.
- Dixon, J. (1967). *Growth through English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kress, G. (2005). Communication now and in the future, *English*, 21, Retrieved May 16, 2005, from <http://www.qca.org.uk/12292.html>.
- Kress, G. (1982). *Learning to write*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Kress, G., Jewitt, C., Bourne, J., Franks, A., Hardcastle, J., Jones, K. & Reid, E. (2005). *English in urban classrooms: Multimodal perspectives on teaching and learning*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Rosen, H. (1972). *Language and class: A critical look at the theories of Basil Bernstein*. London: Falling Wall Press.